

REMARKS

Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice and new Claim 14 has been added.

Claims 2, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended so that they are now dependent upon newly added Claim 14, instead of cancelled Claim 12.

Claim 14 is considered to define the scale collector of the filter of the invention more clearly in accordance with page 3, lines 1-4, page 4, line 9-page 5, line 1 and page 8, lines 5-13 of the specification.

The rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6, 10, 11 and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Trably is considered to lack merit.

Trably is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the filter defined by even Claim 14, the most generic claim.

Unlike the filter defined by Claim 14, the filter of Trably does not have a scale collector comprising a mesh material having a surface to which scale is attracted. Instead, as shown on page 3, lines 21-28, Trably does not employ a scale collector to remove scale from a liquid, but prevents the formation of scale by the use of an ion-exchange resin that removes scale forming cations from the liquid.

The rejection of Claims 4-6, 9-11 and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Heiligman is considered to lack merit.

Heiligman is not considered to teach, or even suggest, the filter defined by even Claim 14, the most generic claim.

Unlike the filter defined by Claim 14, the filter of Heiligman does not have a scale collector comprising a mesh material having a surface to which scale is attracted. Instead, as shown in column 2, lines 55-61, column 3-line 42-column 4, line 29 and Fig. 2, the scale collector of the filter of Heiligman is a filter media positioned between two mesh screens 48 and 52.

The rejection of Claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Heiligman in view of Ida et al is considered to lack merit.

Heiligman is not considered to teach, or even suggest the filter defined by Claim 7 for reasons given in regard to parent Claim 14. In addition, there is no teaching, or even suggestion, in Heiligman that the scale collector comprise a compacted mesh block as recited in the instant claim. The Ida et al patent, which does not teach, or even suggest a scale collector comprising mesh material to the surface of which scale is attracted, clearly does not fill these gaps in the teaching of Heiligman.

The allowability of Claim 13 is noted.

An early allowance of the claims and case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Norman N. Spain
Norman N. Spain, Reg. 17,846
Consulting Patent Attorney
(914) 333-9640

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:
COMMISSIONER For PATENTS
Washington, D.C. 20231

On _____
(Date)

By _____
(Signature)